

February 4, 1976

First of all in reply to Senator Mills, I'd like to point out to Senator Mills, who is a very adept manipulator of the rules to his own advantage on this floor, that after he has read the Committee statement he will find, maybe not to his liking, but if you'll read the amendment carefully that the Committee did adopt the amendments and send the bill to the floor. The amendments that are on your desk at this time are the original contents of the bill. The bill was heard in Committee. The bill was discussed thoroughly. The original bill, as proposed, carried some technical flaws. The Committee was not able to decide in favor of sending that bill to the floor. It's no secret to the members of this body that I had, in another Committee, a bill to increase the pari-mutuel tax. I proposed and the Committee supported me. If you would like to, I could have those names read as to how the Committee voted in regard to sending the bill to the floor. I proposed making it a revenue bill and I sent it to the floor in that manner. That's the manner that it arrived on this floor. During the period of time that has elapsed since we recessed last June, I took the liberty of visiting with the proponents of the bill who had asked me to introduce the bill and asked them if they would like to have the Committee amendments ... the original bill made technically perfect in so far as our Bill Drafter was able to do so. They indicated to me that they would like to have that done. I did that.

That is what I would propose to submit to you at this time in lieu of the Committee amendments. The Committee amendments are a revenue bill. That bill was defeated by the Revenue Committee. I would suggest that you defeat that amendment at this time and allow me to substitute instead the contents of the original bill as proposed by the Committee on Agriculture at the request of a group of individuals from Buffalo County.

There are arguments that Senator Mills can talk about. He can talk about sending it back to the Committee for another hearing. The bill which will be before you, if the membership of this body supports me, will be the bill which was heard in Committee. The bill had a public hearing. It does not need another public hearing. The bill is in proper form at the present time. Senator Mills knows what is in the bill. He may not want to concede that he knows, but if he wants to vote against the bill that's his privilege and prerogative to do so. He can do so in any manner he chooses to do that. But to contend that the bill needs another public hearing is to add confusion to a body which needs no further confusion and to confuse and disarray the supporters of this piece of legislation in a manner that is, I believe, not necessarily conducive to good legislation.

I make no apologies for the fact or the manner in which the bill arrived on the floor. The bill is here. We know what's in the bill. We know what's going to be proposed in the amendments. They've been in the Journal and they've been on your desk. I would suggest ... and I would ask that the bill be considered in its original form. I would ask that you support me in my motion to reject the Committee amendments. Then I would make another motion.